



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,056	03/01/2002	Takahiro Maruyama	220081US0	8219

22850 7590 09/22/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
SAKELARIS, SALLY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1634	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/085,056	MARUYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

All Participants:

(1) Juliet C. Switzer.

(2) Vincent Shier.

Status of Application: restricted

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 September 2003

Time: afternoon

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-8

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A telephonic election was made on 9/5/03. However, contrary to this election, a written restriction was prepared by another examiner. It was agreed that the telephonic election would stand and that no response to the written requirement that was being mailed would be required. Examiner Switzer indicated that the case would be acted on within the month, and that the first office action would note the withdraw of the written restriction, and set forth the restriction discussed 9/5/03 as well as applicant's election of group III, claims 3, 5, 6, and 7, SEQ ID NO: 2 and 15 with traverse. .